

### **Remarks**

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 28, 2004.

Per the above amendment, page 14 of the specification has been corrected per suggestion by the examiner. Moreover, the formula on line 20, page 25 has been corrected, the correction noted during review of the disclosure. The change from "B" to "A" is supported by the specification on page 25, lines 14-15, which states "the amplitudes "A" and "B" are equal to each other".

Regarding the objection to claim 6, claim 6 has been amended in line with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, amended claim 6 is believed to be free from the objection.

Regarding the 35 USC 112 rejections of claims 1-5, the recitations including "point-symmetry" have been removed from claims 1, 4, and 5. Accordingly, amended claims 1, 4, and 5 are believed to be free from the 35 USC 112 rejections.

There is no prior art rejection for claim 4. Accordingly, amended claim 4 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1, 5, and 6 are amended to be directed to methods and apparatuses in orthogonal frequency division multiplexing systems. Amir et al (US Patent No. 6,512,800) fail to teach orthogonal frequency division multiplexing. Accordingly, amended claims 1, 5, and 6 each are believed not to be anticipated by Amir et al. Thus, amended claims 1, 5, and 6 are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

Claim 3 was rejected by the combination of Amir et al and Kowalik et al (US Patent No. 5,663,691). Claim 3 depends from amended claim 1. Since amended claim 1 is believed to be patentable as mentioned above, claim 3 is also believed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and allow the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Louis Woo, RN 31,730  
Law Offices of Louis Woo  
717 North Fayette Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 299-4090

Date: July 22, 2004